

To: Corado, Ana[Corado.Ana@epa.gov]; Kramek, Niva[kramek.niva@epa.gov]
Cc: Brozena, Sarah[Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy] Walls, Michael[Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy]
From: Mascarenhas, Brendan
Sent: Fri 5/19/2017 9:43:01 PM
Subject: ACC Comments on EPA Proposed TSCA S.6 For Use In Vapor Degreasing (EPA-HQ-OPPT-2016-0231)
ACC NMP and DCM Paint and Coating Removal Comments 5-19-17.pdf

Hello Ms. Corado and Ms. Kramek,

Please find attached comments from the American Chemistry Council on EPA's proposed risk management

measures under TSCA Section 6 (as amended by the Frank R. Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act) for certain uses of methylene chloride, also called dichloromethane (DCM), and N-methylpyrrolidone (NMP) (82 Fed. Reg. 7464). ACC members are engaged in some of the uses addressed by this proposal and will be directly impacted by the proposed requirements.

ACC provides these comments to assist the agency in its broader development of a chemical evaluation and management program under the LCSA amendments to TSCA that is efficient, science-based, and consistent with the legal requirements of TSCA. As the comments detail, ACC has the following concerns:

- [REDACTED] EPA's proposal must clearly comply with TSCA Sections 6 and 26 requirements, which include a requirement that all decisions comply with the best available science. EPA should ensure that the supplemental analyses that inform its risk management approach are properly peer-reviewed in this and future proposals.
- [REDACTED] The economic analysis that supports the rulemaking does not satisfy key regulatory guidelines and best practices such as those detailed in OMB Circular A-4. EPA must ensure that the proposed rulemaking satisfies the statutory mandate that EPA apply the best available science and the weight-of-the-scientific evidence to every decision, including economic assumptions. Further, EPA should not simply extrapolate data from other sources and apply it to the other sectors without careful review.
- [REDACTED] Risk management measures applied in response to a TSCA risk evaluation should be based on consideration of a comprehensive set of factors. These measures should not be based on a cursory evaluation of the effectiveness of any one risk management measure alone, but rather an evaluation of a robust set of options, including labeling, personnel training, personal protective equipment, and other useful combinations of risk management. ACC is concerned that

EPA's failure to do so in this proposal has led to proposed restrictions that are unsupported by the scientific evidence, impose unnecessary burden on industry, and have no practical use in achieving sufficient risk reduction.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me via email or phone using the information in the signature block below. Thank you very much for your consideration.

Regards,

Brendan Mascarenhas

Brendan Mascarenhas | American Chemistry Council

Director, Regulatory and Technical Affairs

Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

www.americanchemistry.com

+++++ This message may contain confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee do not disseminate, distribute or copy this email. Please notify the sender immediately by email if you have received this email by mistake and delete this email from your system. E-mail transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure or error-free as information could be intercepted, corrupted, lost, destroyed, arrive late or incomplete, or contain viruses. The sender therefore does not accept liability for any errors or omissions in the contents of this message which arise as a result of email transmission. American Chemistry Council, 700 – 2nd Street NE, Washington, DC 20002, www.americanchemistry.com